

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,594	SCHREDL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Len Tran	1725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Len Tran. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Darren Kang. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 30 November 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Gotman and Leicht et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that the applied prior arts fail to teach a partial fusion of the spacing metallization. However, examiner respectfully disagrees, since the claimed language with the broadest interpretation is not defined over the prior arts of record.

Examiner would like to propose an amendment to the independent claims by referring to applicant's specification on page 5, the advantage of having the "spacing metallization is to eliminate having terminal area of the second substrate having to be assigned in each case to the terminal areas of the first substrate. As a result, a mechanical support or the formation of the spacer is possible also in regions of the second substrate in which no terminal area are provided and that are consequently electrically inactive." Such amendment would be distinguished over the prior arts of record. However, such amendment would necessitate further search and consideration.